

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. The claims are amended herein. Therefore, claims 1-20 remain pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented. Approval and entry are respectfully requested.

II. CLAIM 7 IS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 101

Claim 7 is amended herein to overcome the rejection. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. CLAIMS 1-20 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, AS FAILING TO COMPLY WITH THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Examiner notes the claims disclose a **first user** selecting a first condition and a **second user** selecting a second condition and then a **"third user"** displaying information based on the two conditions. The Examiner asserts the specification does not disclose the "third user." The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Support for the term "third user" can be found, for example, on page 2, line 21 thru page 3 line 14 of the specification. Here, the specification clearly describes at least three users among a plurality of users. For example, the passage cited above refers to, "a first search condition ... for searching information suited to **this user (1st user)**, a second search condition ... suited to this **other user (2nd user)**, and an information searching step of searching for an information element with respect to a **certain user** ... in accordance with the first search condition ... and the second search condition." The term "**certain user**" may apply to either the second user or a third user. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the specification provides support for a "third user."

In order to clarify the invention however, the claims are amended herein to recite a "**certain user**" rather than a **"third user."** Therefore it is respectfully submitted the rejection is overcome.

IV. CLAIMS 9, 10, 13 AND 15 REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH, AS BEING INDEFINITE

The Examiner has rejected claims 9, 10, 13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner notes there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "other user" in the claims. Claims 9, 10, 13 and 15 are amended herein to recite a "second user." Therefore, it is respectfully submitted the rejection is overcome.

V. CLAIMS 1-20 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY HAKEN (U.S. APPLICATION NO. 2004/0008972)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-20 as being anticipated by Haken. Claims 1-20 are amended herein to further clarify the invention. Support for the amended claims can be found on pages 6, line 16 thru page 8, line 25 and page 37, lines 12-20 of the specification. Therefore, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The amended claim 1, for example, recites in part an *information searching step of searching, from within (1) browsing target information, ...for an information element with respect to a certain user... and (2) information derived from the second search condition information set in said second search condition information setting step*. Claim 1 also recites an *information presenting step of presenting to the certain user a piece of information corresponding to a searched result*.

The Examiner cites paragraphs 34 and 37-39 of Haken as disclosing an information-searching step as recited in claim 1, for example. However, Haken does not disclose the information browse method of the present invention as recited in claim 1, for example, wherein the user searches *from within browsing target information, for an information element with respect to a certain user in accordance with information derived from the first search condition information set in said first search condition information setting step and information derived from the second search condition information set in said second search condition information setting step*.

In contrast, Haken discloses a personal television recorder (PTR) wherein recommended recording events can be sent by remote users with flagged usernames, wherein the recommendation will be entered into a recording schedule. (see paragraph 34). Also, Haken discloses a PTR owner may "...give a friend or family member authority to program the user's PTR." (see paragraph 39).

The Examiner appears to assert that recommended recording events sent by a remote user to a PTR owner is the same as *searchin, from within browsing target information, ... for an information element with respect to a certain user in accordance with information derived from the first search condition information set in said first search condition information setting step*, as recited in claim 1. However, Haken does not disclose searching within browsing target information, for an information element with respect to a certain user. The method taught by Haken appears to only disclose searching within a list of television programs, selecting certain programs and providing the list as recommendations to another remote user (see Haken paragraphs 34-41).

Haken does not disclose a ***first search condition information setting step of setting a condition, inputted by any one user among a plurality of users, for searching for information suited to a first user; and a second search condition information setting step of setting a condition, inputted by any one among the plurality of users in a way that specifies a second user, for searching information suited to this second user***, as recited in claim 1, for example. At best, Haken only discloses a first search condition wherein the PTR permits the user to specify a preference list related to the first user (see paragraph 6). Haken does not disclose setting a second search condition for a second user, as recited in claim 1, for example. Instead, Haken discloses a second user is presented with a list of recommendations from a first user (among a plurality of users – see paragraph 8 of Haken).

Haken also does not disclose *an information searching step of searching, from within browsing target information containing a plurality of information elements, for an information element with respect to a certain user in accordance with information derived from the first search condition information set in said first search condition information setting step and information derived from the second search condition*, as recited in claim 1 for example. Instead Haken simply disclose the ability of a user to search within a list of television programs based upon the preferences of a first user (paragraph 6). Haken discloses these programs may be sent to a second user as recommendations (paragraph 8). The Examiner appears to assert the PTR preference list of the owner and family members discloses an equivalent first search condition and second search condition (Haken paragraphs 34 and 37-39). However, Haken does not disclose searching *in accordance with information derived from said first search condition ... and information derived from the second search condition*, as recited in claim 1. In contrast, Haken simply discloses the owners of PTRs can program the device according to their preferences and send recommendations of television programming to other owners of PTR's (see paragraphs 34 and 37-39). Therefore, Haken does not disclose a method of searching for

television programming based upon a first search condition and a second search condition as recited in claim 1, for example.

Haken fails to disclose all of the features of the present invention as recited in claim 1, for example. Therefore, Haken does not anticipate the present invention because Haken does not disclose a first and second search condition; and Haken does not disclose searching from within target information of the first and second search conditions.

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims over the cited reference. Independent claims 6, 7, and 8 recite features somewhat similar to claim 1; therefore the comments above may be helpful in understanding various differences of these claims over the cited references.

Dependent claims 2-5 and 9-20 depend from independent claims 1 and 6 respectively; and inherit the patentable features thereof. Therefore, the comments above may be applied hereto, where appropriate. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5 and 9-20 also patentably distinguish over Haken.

VI. CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: November 29, 2005

By: Paul I. Kavetz
Paul I. Kavetz
Registration No. 35,230

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501